```
1
       IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
2
                  NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA
3
4
    W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his )
5
    capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL )
    OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and )
6
    OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE
    ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,)
7
    in his capacity as the
    TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES)
    FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
9
                 Plaintiff,
10
                                   )4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ
    vs.
11
    TYSON FOODS, INC., et al,
12
                 Defendants.
13
14
                      THE VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF
15
    GORDON JOHNSON, PhD, produced as a witness on
16
    behalf of the Defendants in the above styled and
17
    numbered cause, taken on the 18th day of August,
18
    2008, in the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa, State
19
    of Oklahoma, before me, Lisa A. Steinmeyer, a
20
    Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly certified under
21
    and by virtue of the laws of the State of Oklahoma.
22
23
24
25
```

1	be involved in managing and supervising or	
2	summarizing soils data rather than you doing it?	
3	A Well, I don't know. You'd have to ask him	
4	that question. I was pleased that he did it, so I	
5	wouldn't have to convert from that form that they	01:24PM
6	summarized it in to an Excel file.	
7	$oldsymbol{Q}$ Okay. Explain this table attached to the	
8	E-mail. How does one read this?	
9	A These are average soil test values for the	
10	years identified or the period identified in the	01:25PM
11	headings across the top of the the top row in the	
12	table, and then on the left-hand column is a	
13	percentile so that the dataset was grouped into	
14	percentile for each of those periods or years. So	
15	when you look at the 90 percentile for all years,	01:25PM
16	there were 8,474 observations. The upper 10 percent	
17	of that dataset I believe averaged 1,188 if I	
18	remember how to do this correctly.	
19	Q So the numbers in the other fields, once you	
20	get to the right of the percentile column, these are	01:26PM
21	STP numbers?	
22	A Yes, those are STP numbers.	
23	Q Okay. So when you say that the upper 10	
24	percent for all years was 1,188, what does that mean	
25	in practical terms?	01:26PM

1	A	That means they're very high	
2	Q	Okay.	
3	A	in practical terms.	
4	Q	That's too practical. Does that mean that the	
5	avera	ge or the highest 10 percent equals 1,188?	01:26PM
6	A	No. I believe it means that the upper 10	
7	percer	nt are above a value of 1,188. I said average	
8	before	e, but I retract that. I believe it's an	
9	actual	l value above which the rest of the samples	
10	would	fall.	01:27PM
11	Q	All right. Can you explain the shading that	
12	is on	the table?	
13	A	The shading that he applied, I think I'm	
14	not su	are why he shaded some of them the way he did,	
15	and al	ll I did have shades of gray and so it's not as	01:27PM
16	inform	mative as it was when it was actually different	
17	colors	s. If we go over to the third column for June	
18	2004 t	to June 2007 and then go down to where the	
19	shadir	ng changes from 66 to 61, the way I would	
20	inter	pret that is that 8 percent of the samples had	01:28PM
21	a valı	ue of less than 66 and that number would have	
22	been p	picked because 65 is the agronomic critical	
23	level		
24	Q	That's according to you, that's the	
25	agrono	omic critical level; that's one of your	01:28PM

1	opinions in this case; correct?	
2	A Well, it is the agronomic critical level using	
3	Oklahoma soil tests.	
4	Q Now, did to what extent did you make use of	
5	or rely on this table in preparing your opinions?	01:28PM
6	A I used it in preparing my opinions for the	
7	preliminary injunction. I don't believe I've used	
8	it in my opinions that are identified in this	
9	report. I believe that I've used the some of the	
10	same data but I've summarized it differently than	01:29PM
11	Dr. Fisher did here.	
12	Q And I'm not sure that I have identified that	
13	summary unless it's one of those we've already	
14	looked at.	
15	A Yeah, some of what we've looked at, and I	01:29PM
16	believe that, you know, I've categorized the period	
17	of data from 2000 to 2005 as compared to the data	
18	from 2006 and 2007 for Arkansas in my report, and	
19	that data is more inclusive than this because this	
20	does not include a full year for 2007.	01:30PM
21	Q Okay. If we were to add the additional 2007	
22	data you obtained from Arkansas and Oklahoma to what	
23	is summarized on this, would that be the full set of	
24	publicly available data you considered and used?	
25	A Yes.	01:30PM